

EXHIBIT 18

1 Neel Chatterjee (SBN 173985)
2 *nchatterjee@goodwinlaw.com*
3 **GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**
4 135 Commonwealth Drive
5 Menlo Park, California 94025-1105
6 Tel.: +1 650 752 3100
7 Fax.: +1 650 853 1038

8 Brett Schuman (SBN 189247)
9 *bschuman@goodwinlaw.com*
10 Rachel M. Walsh (SBN 250568)
11 *rwalsh@goodwinlaw.com*
12 **GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**
13 Three Embarcadero Center
14 San Francisco, California 94111
15 Tel.: +1 415 733 6000
16 Fax.: +1 415 677 9041

17 *Attorneys for Defendant*
18 OTTO TRUCKING LLC

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

15 WAYMO LLC,
16
17 Plaintiff,
18 v.
19 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., *et al.*,
20 Defendants.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

**DEFENDANT OTTO TRUCKING LLC'S
OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO
PLAINTIFF WAYMO LLC'S SECOND
SET OF EXPEDITED REQUESTS FOR
PRODUCTION**

Trial Date: October 10, 2017

21 PROPOUNDING PARTY: Plaintiff: WAYMO LLC
22 RESPONDING PARTY: Defendant: OTTO TRUCKING LLC
23 SET: Second Set of Expedited Requests for Production
24
25
26
27
28

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 33, Defendant Otto Trucking LLC (“Otto Trucking”) hereby provides objections and responses (“Objections” and “Responses”) to Plaintiff Waymo LLC’s (“Waymo”) Second Set of Expedited Requests for Production (the “Requests”) served by Waymo on Otto Trucking on May 26, 2017.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Otto Trucking states that it is responding to the Requests to the best of its present ability. Otto Trucking has not completed its pre-trial research, investigation, or analysis of all the facts relating to this case, however, and has not completed its preparation for trial. Accordingly, while these Responses are based upon appropriate investigation by Otto Trucking and its counsel, they reflect the current state of Otto Trucking’s knowledge respecting the matters about which inquiry is made. Thus, the information contained herein remains subject to further review, and, in making these Responses, Otto Trucking reserves the right to amend, supplement, and/or otherwise change its Responses to these Requests as further investigation and discovery may make appropriate in accordance with Otto Trucking’s obligations under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Furthermore, Otto Trucking has prepared these Responses based on its good faith interpretation and understanding of each individual Request, but Otto Trucking reserves its right to correct any errors or omissions.

Otto Trucking does not waive or intend to waive any objections that it may have regarding the use of any information provided, and Otto Trucking expressly reserves the rights to: (a) object to Plaintiff’s use of any information provided on the ground of inadmissibility; and (b) object on any and all proper grounds, at any time, to any other discovery involving or relating to any information produced. No incidental or implied admissions are intended by the Responses set forth herein.

These Responses are made solely for the purpose of this action. Nothing herein shall be construed as an admission respecting the admissibility or the relevance of any facts, documents, or information, as an admission that documents or information exist, or as an admission as to the truth or accuracy of any characterization or assertion contained in any Request. Each Response is

1 subject to all objections as to competence, relevance, materiality, propriety, and admissibility, and
2 any and all other objections on grounds that would require the exclusion of any statement herein if
3 any of the Requests were asked of, or statements contained herein were made by, a witness present
4 and testifying in court, all of which objections and grounds are reserved and may be interposed at
5 the time of trial.

6 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

7 1. Otto Trucking objects to the Requests to the extent it purports to impose any
8 obligations upon Otto Trucking beyond those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,
9 the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, and any
10 applicable orders of this Court, including the Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part
11 Plaintiff's Motion for Provisional Relief.

12 2. Otto Trucking objects to the Requests on the grounds that they are overbroad and
13 unduly burdensome, indefinite as to time and scope, call for information not relevant to any claim
14 or defense in this litigation, and are not proportional to the needs of the case.

15 3. Otto Trucking objects to each and every Request to the extent it seeks information
16 protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the joint
17 defense privilege, or any other privilege. Plaintiff's discovery will not be construed to seek such
18 information. Inadvertent disclosure of privileged information is not intended to be, and may not
19 be construed as, a waiver of any applicable privilege or similar basis for non-disclosure.

20 4. Otto Trucking reserves the right to supplement or amend its responses if new or
21 further information is obtained in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(e).

22 **SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION**
23 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:**

24 All lab notebooks belonging to LiDAR personnel or associated with LiDAR workstations.

25 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:**

26 Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking
27 further objects to this Request as not "reasonably narrow" or relevant to its "trade secret
28

misappropriation claims *only*,” as required by the Court’s Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiff’s Motion for Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464). Otto Trucking further objects to this Request as vague and ambiguous, as to the terms “LiDAR personnel” and “LiDAR workstations” are nowhere defined.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as follows: Otto Trucking has not located any documents responsive to this Request in its possession, custody, or control following a diligent search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:

DOCUMENTS sufficient to show how the placement of FAC lenses on laser diodes is performed.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:

Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking further objects to this Request as not “reasonably narrow” or relevant to its “trade secret misappropriation claims *only*,” as required by the Court’s Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiff’s Motion for Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464).

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as follows: Otto Trucking has not located any documents responsive to this Request in its possession, custody, or control following a diligent search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:

DOCUMENTS sufficient to show the design of any assembly tools for FAC lenses.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:

Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking further objects to this Request as not “reasonably narrow” or relevant to its “trade secret misappropriation claims *only*,” as required by the Court’s Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiff’s Motion for Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464). Otto Trucking further objects to this Request as vague and ambiguous, as the term “assembly tools” is nowhere defined.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as

1 follows: Otto Trucking has not located any documents responsive to this Request in its
2 possession, custody, or control following a diligent search.

3 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:**

4 All COMMUNICATIONS between Brian McClendon and LEVANDOWSKI.

5 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:**

6 Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking
7 further objects to this Request as not “reasonably narrow” or relevant to its “trade secret
8 misappropriation claims *only*,” as required by the Court’s Order Granting in Part and Denying in
9 Part Plaintiff’s Motion for Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464). Otto Trucking objects to this
10 Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks “[a]ll
11 COMMUNICATIONS.”

12 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as
13 follows: Otto Trucking has not located any communications responsive to this Request in its
14 possession, custody or control following a diligent search.

15 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:**

16 All COMMUNICATIONS between Brian McClendon and any PERSON REGARDING
17 OTTOMOTTO or OTTO TRUCKING before August 23, 2016.

18 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:**

19 Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking
20 further objects to this Request as not “reasonably narrow” or relevant to its “trade secret
21 misappropriation claims *only*,” as required by the Court’s Order Granting in Part and Denying in
22 Part Plaintiff’s Motion for Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464). Otto Trucking further objects to
23 this Request to the extent it seeks information or materials not within Otto Trucking’s possession,
24 custody, or control.

25 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as
26 follows: Otto Trucking has not located any communications responsive to this Request in its
27 possession, custody or control following a diligent search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:

All COMMUNICATIONS between Travis Kalanick and LEVANDOWSKI.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:

Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking further objects to this Request as not “reasonably narrow” or relevant to its “trade secret misappropriation claims *only*,” as required by the Court’s Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiff’s Motion for Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464). Otto Trucking objects to this Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks “[a]ll COMMUNICATIONS.”

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as follows: Otto Trucking has not located any communications responsive to this Request in its possession, custody or control following a diligent search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:

All COMMUNICATIONS between Travis Kalanick and any PERSON REGARDING LiDAR.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:

Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking further objects to this Request as not “reasonably narrow” or relevant to its “trade secret misappropriation claims *only*,” as required by the Court’s Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiff’s Motion for Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464). Otto Trucking further objects to this Request to the extent it seeks information or materials not within Otto Trucking’s possession, custody, or control. Otto Trucking further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks communications protected by the attorney client privilege, the attorney work product doctrine, joint defense or common interest privilege, and/or any other applicable privilege or immunity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as follows: Otto Trucking has not located any communications responsive to this Request in its possession, custody or control following a diligent search.

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:**

2 All COMMUNICATIONS between Travis Kalanick and any PERSON REGARDING,
3 LEVANDOWSKI, OTTOMOTTO or OTTO TRUCKING before August 23, 2016.

4 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:**

5 Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking
6 further objects to this Request as not “reasonably narrow” or relevant to its “trade secret
7 misappropriation claims *only*,” as required by the Court’s Order Granting in Part and Denying in
8 Part Plaintiff’s Motion for Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464). Otto Trucking further objects to
9 this Request to the extent it seeks information or materials not within Otto Trucking’s possession,
10 custody, or control. Otto Trucking further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks
11 communications protected by the attorney client privilege, the attorney work product doctrine,
12 joint defense or common interest privilege, and/or any other applicable privilege or immunity.

13 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as
14 follows: Otto Trucking has not located any communications responsive to this Request in its
15 possession, custody or control following a diligent search.

16 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:**

17 All invoices submitted to any DEFENDANT in connection with the March 4 Engagement
18 Letter (Exhibit 3 to the May 8, 2017 Declaration of Eric A. Tate in Support of Defendants’
19 Opposition to Waymo’s Motion to Compel).

20 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:**

21 Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking
22 further objects to this Request as not “reasonably narrow” or relevant to its “trade secret
23 misappropriation claims *only*,” as required by the Court’s Order Granting in Part and Denying in
24 Part Plaintiff’s Motion for Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464). Otto Trucking further objects to
25 this Request to the extent that it seeks communications protected by the attorney client privilege,
26 the attorney work product doctrine, joint defense or common interest privilege, and/or any other
27 applicable privilege or immunity.

1 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as
 2 follows: Otto Trucking has not located any documents or communications responsive to this
 3 Request in its possession, custody or control following a diligent search.

4 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:**

5 All COMMUNICATIONS between any DEFENDANT and John Gardner.

6 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:**

7 Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking
 8 further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks communications protected by the joint
 9 defense or common interest privilege. Otto Trucking further objects to this Request to the extent
 10 that it seeks communications protected by the attorney client privilege, the attorney work product
 11 doctrine, and/or any other applicable privilege or immunity. Otto Trucking further objects to this
 12 Request as not “reasonably narrow” or relevant to its “trade secret misappropriation claims *only*,”
 13 as required by the Court’s Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiff’s Motion for
 14 Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464). Otto Trucking further objects to this Request to the extent it
 15 seeks documents unrelated to any claims or defenses in this matter. Otto Trucking objects to this
 16 Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks “[a]ll
 17 COMMUNICATIONS.”

18 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as
 19 follows: documents responsive to this Request are subject to the joint defense privilege, common
 20 interest privilege, attorney-client privilege, and the attorney work-product doctrine, and have been
 21 logged in privilege logs served on April 13, 2017 in Defendants’ Supplemental Privilege Log
 22 Associated with March 31, 2017 Production of Documents, on April 27, 2017 in Defendants’
 23 Amended Supplemental Privilege Log Associated with March 31, 2017 Production of Documents,
 24 on April 28, 2017 in Defendants’ Privilege Log Associated with March 31, 2017 Production of
 25 Documents, on May 1, 2017 in Defendants’ Privilege Log Associated with March 31, 2017
 26 Production of Documents, and on May 22, 2017 in Uber Technologies, Inc. and Ottomotto LLC’s
 27 Privilege Log 5.22.2017 (O’Melveny & Myers LLP).

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:

All agreements and “software modules” identified in Sections 2.8, 2.10 and 2.15 of the OTTOMOTTO DISCLOSURE SCHEDULES.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:

Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking further objects to this Request as not “reasonably narrow” or relevant to its “trade secret misappropriation claims *only*,” as required by the Court’s Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiff’s Motion for Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464).

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as follows: Otto Trucking has not located any documents responsive to this Request in its possession, custody, or control following a diligent search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:

All agreements identified in Sections 2.10 and 2.15 of the OTTO TRUCKING DISCLOSURE SCHEDULES.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:

Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking further objects to this Request as not “reasonably narrow” or relevant to its “trade secret misappropriation claims *only*,” as required by the Court’s Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiff’s Motion for Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464).

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as follows: Otto Trucking states that it has produced documents responsive to this Request. Otto Trucking will further produce indemnification agreements and restricted unit purchase agreements responsive to this Request following a diligent search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:

All agreements between TYTO and/or ODIN WAVE, on the one hand, and any DEFENDANT or LEVANDOWSKI, on the other, and any disclosures, schedules, exhibits, appendices, or attachments to such agreements.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:

Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking further objects to this Request as not “reasonably narrow” or relevant to its “trade secret misappropriation claims *only*,” as required by the Court’s Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiff’s Motion for Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464). Otto Trucking objects to this Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks “[a]ll agreements.”

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as follows: Otto Trucking has not located any agreements responsive to this Request in its possession, custody or control following a diligent search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:

All COMMUNICATIONS between any DEFENDANT and NALUX REGARDING FAC lenses or LIDAR.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:

Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking further objects to this Request as not “reasonably narrow” or relevant to its “trade secret misappropriation claims *only*,” as required by the Court’s Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiff’s Motion for Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464). Otto Trucking objects to this Request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks “[a]ll COMMUNICATIONS.”

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as follows: Otto Trucking has not located any documents responsive to this Request in its possession, custody or control following a diligent search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24:

All DOCUMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING any of LEVANDOWSKI’s past and present “Authorized Devices” (as that term is defined in UBER00006444, Section 7), INCLUDING (without limitation) any request for approval in connection with Section 7.2 or any de-authorization (whether contemplated or effectuated [*sic*])

1 under Section 7.3.

2 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24:**

3 Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking
4 further objects to this Request as not “reasonably narrow” or relevant to its “trade secret
5 misappropriation claims *only*,” as required by the Court’s Order Granting in Part and Denying in
6 Part Plaintiff’s Motion for Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464). Otto Trucking further objects to
7 this Request to the extent that it seeks information protected by the attorney client privilege, the
8 attorney work product doctrine, joint defense or common interest privilege, and/or any other
9 applicable privilege or immunity.

10 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as
11 follows: Otto Trucking has not located any documents or communications responsive to this
12 Request in its possession, custody or control following a diligent search.

13 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 25:**

14 All DOCUMENTS REGARDING the satisfaction of conditions for closing in the
15 ACQUISITION DOCUMENTS.

16 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 25:**

17 Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking
18 further objects to this Request as not “reasonably narrow” or relevant to its “trade secret
19 misappropriation claims *only*,” as required by the Court’s Order Granting in Part and Denying in
20 Part Plaintiff’s Motion for Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464). Otto Trucking objects to this
21 Request to the extent it seeks documents protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney-
22 work product doctrine, the joint defense privilege and any other applicable privileges.

23 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as
24 follows: Documents responsive to this Request are subject to the joint defense privilege, the
25 common interest privilege, the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and
26 have been logged in privilege logs served on April 13, 2017 in Defendants’ Supplemental
27 Privilege Log Associated with March 31, 2017 Production of Documents, on April 27, 2017 in
28

1 Defendants' Amended Supplemental Privilege Log Associated with March 31, 2017 Production of
2 Documents, on April 28, 2017 in Defendants' Privilege Log Associated with March 31, 2017
3 Production of Documents, on May 1, 2017 in Defendants' Privilege Log Associated with March
4 31, 2017 Production of Documents, and on May 22, 2017 in Uber Technologies, Inc. and
5 Ottomotto LLC's Privilege Log 5.22.2017 (O'Melveny & Myers LLP).

6 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 26:**

7 All DOCUMENTS submitted REGARDING reaching Milestones to trigger payments set
8 forth in LEVANDOWSKI'S employment agreement with UBER.

9 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 26:**

10 Otto Trucking incorporates each of its general objections by reference. Otto Trucking
11 further objects to this Request as not "reasonably narrow" or relevant to its "trade secret
12 misappropriation claims *only*," as required by the Court's Order Granting in Part and Denying in
13 Part Plaintiff's Motion for Provisional Relief. (Dkt. No. 464).

14 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Otto Trucking responds as
15 follows: Otto Trucking will produce responsive, non-privileged documents in its possession,
16 custody or control following a diligent search.

1 Dated: June 9, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

2
3 By: /s/ Neel Chatterjee

Neel Chatterjee (SBN 173985)

nchatterjee@goodwinlaw.com

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

135 Commonwealth Drive

Menlo Park, California 94025-1105

Tel.: +1 650 752 3100

6 Fax.: +1 650 853 1038

7 Brett Schuman (SBN 189247)

bschuman@goodwinlaw.com

8 Rachel M. Walsh (SBN 250568)

rwalsh@goodwinlaw.com

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

Three Embarcadero Center

10 San Francisco, California 94111

Tel.: +1 415 733 6000

11 Fax.: +1 415 677 9041

12 *Attorneys for Defendant*

Otto Trucking LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Rachel M. Walsh, declare as follows:

1. I am of counsel at the law firm of Goodwin Procter, LLP, whose address is Three Embarcadero Center, San Francisco, CA 94111. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to this action.
2. On June 9th, 2017, I caused the following document to be served on all counsel of record via electronic mail: Defendant Otto Trucking LLC's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Waymo LLC's Second Set of Expedited Requests for Production Pursuant to Paragraph Six of the May 11, 2017 Preliminary Injunction Order.
3. This document was transmitted via electronic mail to the addresses below, pursuant to the agreement between the parties, and the electronic mail transmission was reported as complete and without error.

Recipient	Email Address:
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP Charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151) David A. Perlson (Bar No. 209502) Melissa Baily (Bar No. 237649) John Neukom (Bar No. 275887) Jordan Jaffe (Bar No. 254886) 50 California Street, 22 nd Floor San Francisco, California 94111-4788 Telephone: (415) 875-6600 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700	QE-Waymo@quinnemanuel.com
Arturo J. Gonzalez Daniel Pierre Muino Eric Akira Tate Esther Kim Chang Matthew Ian Kreeger Michael A. Jacobs MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 425 Market Street San Francisco, CA 94105 Michelle Ching Youn Yang MORRISON FOERSTER LLP 2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW	UberWaymoAttorneys@mofo.com

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Washington, DC 20006 Rudolph Kim MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 755 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, CA 94304 Wendy Joy Ray MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 707 Wilshire Boulevard Suite 6000 Los Angeles, CA 90017	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Michael Darron Jay BOIES SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP 401 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 850 Santa Monica, CA 90401 Meredith Richardson Dearborn BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP 435 Tasso Street Suite 205 Palo Alto, CA 94301 Hamish Hume Jessica E Phillips Karen Leah Dunn Kyle N. Smith Martha Lea Goodman BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP 1401 New York Ave., NW Washington, DC 20005	BSF_EXTERNAL_UberWaymoLit@bsfllp.com
20 21 22 23 24	John L. Cooper Farella Braun + Martel LLP 235 Montgomery Street 17th Floor San Francisco, California 94104 415.954.4410 415.954.4480	jcooper@fbm.com

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 9th day of June, 2017, in San Francisco, CA.

/s/ Rachel M. Walsh

Rachel M. Walsh
Attorneys for OTTO TRUCKING LLC